

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's attention to this application. The Office Action indicates that claims 22-27 are allowed, and claims 2-11 and 13-21 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Office Action also rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

This response amends claims 1-2, 5-8, 12-14, 16-17, and 19-21. The amendments to claims 2, 5-8, 13-14, 16-17, and 19-21 broaden the dependent claims, account for the amendments to the independent claims, and/or correct minor clerical or stylistic issues. The amendments to claims 1 and 12 are discussed below. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

**Argument:**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,782,476 to Yasuhiro Ishibashi (hereinafter "Ishibashi") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,115,376 to W. Paul Sherer et al. (hereinafter "Sherer"). Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections. However, in order to reduce the delays, expenses, and arguments necessary to obtain protection for applicant's invention, this response amends claims 1 and 12 to include material that is similar to one or more of the features recited in claim 6.

Ishibashi pertains to the use of an IEEE 1394 bus for digital content addressed to a personal computer (PC). In particular, Ishibashi suggests a method for authenticating individual components within the PC, such as an MPEG2 decoder and a hard disk drive (HDD), in connection with exchanging copy-protected data between an external device and the PC. (Col. 2, lines 1-65.)

Sherer pertains to an “interconnection device” with a plurality of ports (e.g., a bridge or a switch), where the interconnection device includes a table that maps MAC addresses to particular ports. If the interconnection device receives a packet carrying a source MAC address that is not mapped to a port, “an authentication protocol is executed on the port to determine whether the MAC address originates from an authorized sender.” (Abstract.) For example, when a PC sends a packet to the interconnection device, if the table in the interconnection device does not map the source MAC address of the packet to the port that received the packet, the interconnection device issues a challenge to the PC. The interconnection device then determines whether to accept the packet, based on the response from the PC. (Col. 6, lines 6-45.)

In the present application, claims 1 and 12 pertain to methods for authenticating both video sink devices and video repeater devices in a hierarchy of video devices. In particular, claims 1 and 12 involve operations for (a) authenticating a video repeater device to a video source device, (b) authenticating a video sink device to the video repeater device, and (c) authenticating the video sink device to the video source device. Furthermore, claims 1 and 12 recite that the video repeater device provides, to the video source device, “a device key selection vector for the first video sink device.”

Neither Ishibashi nor Sherer disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 12. Therefore, even if Ishibashi and Sherer were to be combined, the combination would not render claims 1 and 12 unpatentable.

All other rejected claims depend ultimately from claim 1 or claim 12. For the foregoing reasons and other reasons, claims 1-27 are all in condition for allowance.

**Information Disclosure Statements:**

The Office Action included copies of two Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with initials to confirm consideration by the Examiner.

Applicants appreciate such consideration. However, for one of those IDSs (the one that was filed on February 8, 2001, listing references such as U.S. patent no. 4,953,208 to Ideno), there is no signature from the Examiner, nor is the date specified for the "Date Considered." Applicant respectfully requests a signed and dated copy of that IDS.

**Conclusion:**

Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the present claim amendments, a signed and dated copy of the IDS identified above, and prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 24, 2005

/ Michael R. Barre /  
Michael R. Barré  
Registration No. 44,023  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
(512) 732-3927

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026